

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/645,665	DHINDSA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tung X. Le	2821	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tung X. Le.

(3) Primary: Thuy Tran.

(2) Allan M. Lowe.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 02 May 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: Vahedi (U.S. 2004/0000875), Donohoe (U.S. 6,309,978), and Howard (U.S. 2005/0022933).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: A discussion was made in regard to the teachings of prior art of record, with respect to the rejection(s), (i) the cited prior art to Vahedi et al., (ii) the cited prior to Donahoe et al., and (iii) the prior art of record to Howard.

Concerning (i), Applicant's Representative confirmed that both the instant application and the prior art had a common ownership, and therefore, it was not a valid reference. To support this evidence, an affidavit/statement regarding common ownership was requested by the Examiner. Regarding this matter, once the proof was being provided, the finality would be withdrawn;

Concerning (ii), both the Examiner and Applicant's Representative agreed that the reference taught three different frequencies. However, Applicant's Representative asked to prove the effect of the status of plasma such as ion energy, ion density, and chemistry as claimed. The Examiner acknowledged this comment and would take it into consideration; and

Concerning (iii), Applicant's Representative advised that this prior art is the closest reference in that there were three different operating frequencies that inherently effected the plasma in all ion energy, ion density, and chemistry. The Examiner acknowledged this comment and would take it into consideration..